

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicant basically:

1. Amends claim 1 .
2. Amends dependent claim 4 for sake of consistency with amended independent claim 1
3. Adds new dependent claim 18.
4. Respectfully traverses all prior art rejections.

B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2001-193245 to Nagai et al. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-193245 to Nagai et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0053360 to Kinoshita et al as cited in the previous office action. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-193245 to Nagai et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,524,401 to Ishikawa et al as cited in the previous office action. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-193245 to Nagai et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,300,555 to Kondo et al. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-193245 to Nagai et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,242,685 to Mizukami et al as cited in the previous office action. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to describe further that the second frame element comprising a protruding hook which protrudes in a direction toward the eaves

side of the roof, the protruding hook being configured to engage a securing member which protrudes in a second direction opposite the first direction. The amendments are amply supported by, e.g., Applicant's Fig. 13 which shows, e.g., protruding hook 12d which protrudes forward (on an eaves side of a slanted roof), while the engaging portion of the rear securing tool 32 protrudes backward in an opposite direction to a direction of the protruding hook 12d so that the protruding hook 12d can be engaged with the engaging portion of the rear securing tool 32.

Similar structure is required by Applicant's independent claim 13, which specifically includes, e.g.,

wherein the rear-side frame element is provided with a rear hook placed on its upper surface and located on the front hook of the front-side frame element of another module frame and engaged therewith in the front-to-rear direction, and a protruding hook protruding forward on the lower surface, and

...

wherein the securing member includes a plurality of securing metal tools, ..., and a rear securing tool for engaging with the protruding hook of the module frame in the front-to-rear direction, and

Yet more detailed structure is described in dependent claim 4.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 13 thus patentably define over the applied references. Applicant's claimed structure is significantly different from Nagai's configuration comprising "engagement part 26" and "engagement part 43". In fact, in contrast, Nagai shows in Figs. 8 and 9 that the engagement part 26 protrudes backward (on a ridge side of the roof member 100), and the engagement part 43 extending from a standing board part 42 protrudes forward (on an eaves side of the roof member 100). Thus, Applicant's protruding hook and engaging portion of the rear securing tool of the protrude in opposite directions to the directions of the engagement part 26 and the engagement part 43 of Nagai, respectively. Applicant thereby provides a superior structure which can prevent slippage of the solar-battery module M down the eaves side

of the roof more effectively than the engagement part 26 and the engagement part 43 of Nagai.

As indicated above, Applicant's protruding hook and rear securing tool are expressly recited in independent claim 13 (which defines a solar-battery structural unit), as well as claims 14 and 15 (which define an attaching method for the solar-battery structural unit comprising the roof), and 16 (which defines a removing method for a module unit), and are important components for installing a quadrangular solar-battery module on the roof and removing the module from the roof.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsb
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100